

Request for Reconsideration

Applicants thank the Examiner for the careful consideration given this application. Reconsideration of this application is requested in view of the following remarks.

Claims 1-39 are currently pending in this application, of which Claims 1, 14, 23, 32, and 35 are independent claims.

At pages 2-5, the Office Action rejects Claims 1, 14, 23, and 32 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Foadare et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,044,267). The Office Action, at pages 5-10, rejects Claims 2-13, 15-22, 24-31, and 33-39 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Foadare et al. in view of Mahany et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,949,776). These rejections are respectfully traversed for at least the following reasons.

Each of the independent claims (Claims 1, 14, 23, 32, and 35) includes the limitations that a wireless communication device be addressable by a public-switched telephone network (PSTN) coupled to the wireless network (in which the wireless device resides) using a first identification number and that the wireless device be addressable by a peer device associated with the wireless network using a second identification number. The Office Action asserts that these limitations are taught by Foadare et al. in Fig. 1, col. 2, lines 9-21, col. 3, lines 40-48, and col. 8, lines 35-55. Applicants respectfully disagree.

Fig. 1 does, indeed, show a PSTN 14, as noted in the Office Action. The PSTN is shown connected to a home base station (HBS) 20 to which a wireless device 11 may communicate. A wireless device 11 may also communicate through a cellular base

station (CBS) 13, as also shown in Fig. 1. Col. 3, lines 40-48 merely provides description of Fig. 1.

Col. 2, lines 9-21 describes a system in which a cordless/cellular telephone (CCT) may communicate either through a cordless base station or a cellular base station. When the telephone network receives a call to a CCT's land-line number (LL#) or to the CCT's mobile identification number (MIN), it determines if the CCT is within range of its HBS and if not, routes the call to the CCT via the cellular network. Col. 8, lines 35-55 (and Fig. 6) merely describes the details of this process.

The Office Action, noting page 3, asserts that Fig. 1, block 14 and col. 3, lines 40-48 read on a public-switched telephone network (PSTN) coupled to a wireless network, and that the wireless communication device 11 is addressable by the PSTN using a first identification number, corresponding to the MIN (noting the above passages from cols. 2 and 8). The Office Action then asserts that the claim element that the wireless communication device be addressable by a peer device associated with the wireless network using a second identification number corresponds to the use of the LL#, cited the passages from cols. 2, 3, and 8.

It is respectfully submitted that this reading of the cited reference fails because Foladare et al. altogether lacks disclosure of addressing a wireless communication device by a *peer* device using a second identification number. In other words, to read on this limitation, according to the assertions above, Foladare et al. would need to disclose a second CCT addressing a first CCT using the LL#. However, in Foladare et al., *no peer device addresses another peer device*. The CCTs are all addressed by the network infrastructure elements, whether local (HBS) or cellular (CBS).

For at least these reasons, Foladare et al. fails to anticipate any of the independent claims, which are, therefore, allowable over Foladare et al. Furthermore, Mahany et al. fails to remedy these deficiencies of Foladare et al., and so the claims rejected on the basis of the combination of Foladare et al. with Mahany et al. are also allowable over the cited references.

Applicants may not have presented all possible arguments or have refuted the characterizations of either the claims or the prior art as found in the Office Action. However, the lack of such arguments or refutations is not intended to act as a waiver of such arguments or as concurrence with such characterizations.


Conclusion

Applicants believe that the above remarks address all of the grounds for rejection and place the application in condition for allowance. Applicants, therefore, respectfully request prompt and favorable consideration of this Response and reconsideration of this application.

If the Examiner believes, for any reason, that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number provided.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: November 19, 2007


Jeffrey W. Gluck, Ph.D.
Registration No. 44,457
Connolly Bove Lodge & Hutz LLP
1990 M Street NW, Suite 800
Washington, DC 20036-3425
Telephone: 202-331-7111
Direct Dial: 202-572-0322
Facsimile: 202-293-6229